

FILED

1 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332)
2 United States Attorney

MAR 12 2010

3 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)
4 Chief, Criminal Division

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

5 ROBERT N. MICHAELS (PABN 200918)
6 Special Assistant United States Attorney

7 Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law
8 1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
9 Monterey, CA 93944
Telephone: (831) 242-4537
FAX: (831) 242-5198

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Criminal No.: CR-09-00921 MAG
14 Plaintiff,)
15 vs.) STIPULATION AND ORDER EXCLUDING
16 MIGUEL ANGEL PULIDO,) TIME
17 Defendant.)
18

19 On February 1, 2010 the parties in this case appeared before the Court. The parties jointly
20 requested that the case be continued from February 1, 2010 to April 5, 2010 at 9:00 am, for a
21 status conference. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial
22 Act, from February 1, 2010 to April 5, 2010. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of
23 time is appropriate for potential disposition.

24 /
25 /
26 /
27
28 STIPULATION AND ORDER EXCLUDING TIME 1
29 CASE NO: CR-09-00921 MAG

1 SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

3 DATED:

4 /S/
ROBERT N. MICHAELS
5 Special Assistant United States Attorney

6 DATED:

7 /S/
NICK HUMY
8 Counsel for MIGUEL ANGEL PULIDO

10 ORDER

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from February 1, 2010 to April 5, 2010. The Court finds, based on
13 the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested
14 continuance and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The
15 failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary
16 for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
17 miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made
18 under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 DATED:

3/12/10

21 HOWARD R. LLOYD
United States Magistrate Judge